

# Exhibit E

**From:** [Bowen, Tyler R. \(PHX\)](#)  
**To:** [Henrik Parker](#)  
**Cc:** [Timothy Devlin](#); [Campbell, Chad \(PHX\)](#); [Morin, Philip A. \(SDO\)](#); [Ta, Janice \(AUS\)](#); [oceansemi-dlf](#)  
**Subject:** RE: Ocean Semiconductor v STMicro -- extending deadline for FICs  
**Date:** Friday, January 21, 2022 1:40:08 PM  
**Attachments:** [image002.png](#)

---

Rik,

ST contests the assertions in Ocean's draft motion for extension. Nevertheless, as a courtesy, ST agrees to an extension of the February 2 deadline for serving final infringement contentions to March 30 so long as the same extension applies to final invalidity contentions. Please confirm receipt of this email and Ocean's agreement to these terms. ST also expects that Ocean will reciprocate should ST require adjustment to extend the court's schedule.

The time pressure Ocean has identified is a problem of its own making. The schedule adopted by the court was urged by Ocean. Ocean sued downstream chipmakers rather than the tool or software suppliers directly. And despite knowing about the need for extensive third-party discovery since at least Dec. 31, 2020 when the complaint was filed, Ocean took no actions to seek that discovery early and has waiting to seek discovery from some suppliers until over five weeks after discovery opened. ST has concerns about the effects this extension will have on the rest of the schedule for this case, including shortening the time period for discovery tied to final contentions. ST agrees to this extension with the understanding that Ocean's final infringement contentions due on March 30 will be final and will not expand the scope of the current case. ST is also not expecting any further requests to extend the deadline for final contentions.

Please provide ST with the notice Ocean intends to file with the court so we can review and approve it.

Regards,  
Tyler

---

**From:** Henrik Parker <[hparker@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:hparker@devlinlawfirm.com)>  
**Sent:** Friday, January 21, 2022 12:30 PM  
**To:** Bowen, Tyler R. (PHX) <[TBowen@perkinscoie.com](mailto:TBowen@perkinscoie.com)>  
**Cc:** Timothy Devlin <[tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:tdevlin@devlinlawfirm.com)>; Campbell, Chad (PHX) <[CSCampbell@perkinscoie.com](mailto:CSCampbell@perkinscoie.com)>; Morin, Philip A. (SDO) <[PMorin@perkinscoie.com](mailto:PMorin@perkinscoie.com)>; Ta, Janice (AUS) <[JTa@perkinscoie.com](mailto:JTa@perkinscoie.com)>; [oceansemi-dlf](#) <[oceansemi-dlf@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:oceansemi-dlf@devlinlawfirm.com)>  
**Subject:** Ocean Semiconductor v STMicro -- extending deadline for FICs

Tyler:

I believe that STMicro is the only defendant who has not responded with its position with respect to my email of yesterday concerning Ocean Semiconductor's proposed extension of the deadline for FICs.

All of the other defendants have now agreed to the extended date.

Can you please provide STMicro's position?

Best regards,  
Rik



\*\*\*\*\*

The information contained in this communication is confidential and is intended only for the use of the intended addressee. It is the property of Devlin Law Firm LLC, and may contain information subject to attorney-client privilege and/or may constitute inside information. Unauthorized use, disclosure or copying of this communication or any part thereof is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please notify us immediately by return e-mail or by e-mail to [correspondence@devlinlawfirm.com](mailto:correspondence@devlinlawfirm.com), and destroy this communication and all copies thereof, including all attachments.